

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
SOUTHERN DIVISION

RUDY A. WARE,

Case No. 1:07-CV-338

Plaintiff,

Hon. Richard Alan Enslen

v.

MICHIGAN DEPARTMENT
OF LABOR, et al.,

Defendants.

ORDER

Plaintiff has initiated the present action against the Michigan Department of Labor and the Michigan Department of Civil Service. The Court has granted Plaintiff's motion to proceed as a pauper in this matter. Having granted Plaintiff's motion to proceed as a pauper, the Court has conducted an initial review of the Complaint pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2) to determine whether it is frivolous, malicious, or fails to state a claim upon which relief can be granted. Upon review, the Court concludes that Plaintiff's Complaint must be dismissed because the Court lacks subject matter jurisdiction over the claims asserted in the Complaint.

Unlike state courts, which are courts of general jurisdiction, the federal courts are courts of limited jurisdiction. A significant limitation upon the jurisdiction of the federal district courts is that such courts are precluded from reviewing judgments of the state courts. As the Supreme Court has long recognized, the jurisdiction of the federal district courts is "strictly original" and, therefore, only the

United States Supreme Court can “entertain a proceeding to reverse or modify” a judgment entered by a state court. *Rooker v. Fidelity Trust Co.*, 263 U.S. 413, 415-16 (1923).

Plaintiff requests that this Court overturn a final decision entered by the courts of the State of Michigan regarding a worker’s compensation claim. This Court lacks the authority and jurisdiction to grant Plaintiff the relief he seeks. *See Exxon Mobile Corp. v. Saudi Basic Indus. Corp.*, 544 U.S. 280, 284 (2005) (the federal district courts lack subject matter jurisdiction in “cases brought by state-court losers complaining of injuries caused by state-court judgments rendered before the district court proceedings commenced and inviting district court review and rejection of those judgments”). Accordingly, the Court hereby dismisses Plaintiff’s action.

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Plaintiff’s Complaint (Dkt. No. 1) is **DISMISSED** for lack of subject matter jurisdiction.

DATED in Kalamazoo, MI:
June 4, 2007

/s/ Richard Alan Enslen
RICHARD ALAN ENSLEN
SENIOR UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE